



REMARKS

In the outstanding office action, claims 1-23 were presented for examination. The abstract and claims 1, 10, 12 and 16 were objected to. Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0094385 filed by Peter Lee.

Concerning the objections to the abstract and claims applicant has the same in accordance with the guidelines provided in the outstanding office action. More specifically, the abstract has been amended to delete the word “comprising” while claims 1, 10, 12 and 16 were amended to address the objections identified in the outstanding office action. No new matter has been added. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the specification and claims 1, 10, 12 and 16.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include the limitation of “said first housing portion defining a receiving area for receiving and substantially covering all of said second housing portion therein” and independent claim 15 was amended to include the following limitation “said upper housing portion defining a receiving area for receiving and covering substantially all of said lower housing portion therein”, which applicant respectfully submits is clearly not shown, disclosed or taught by the Lee reference. Support for this amendment is clearly found in the specification and drawings of the present application thus no new matter has been added.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988).

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 10 and 15 are allowable over the Lee reference as the same fails to teach or disclose a “first housing portion defining a receiving area for receiving and substantially covering all of said second housing portion therein” or an “upper housing portion defining a receiving area for receiving and covering substantially all of said lower housing portion therein” . Accordingly, claims 1, 10 and 15 are believed to be allowable over the Lee reference.

Claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-23 depend from either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 10 and 15 accordingly, claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-23 are also believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 10 and 15 in addition to including additional limitations.

In view of the above amendments and the discussion relating thereto, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is most earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicants’ attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below for an interview.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise,
please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130, maintained by the applicant's
attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: John F. Buckert
John F. Buckert
Reg. No. 44,572

Date: February 27, 2006
Telephone: (248) 524-2300
Fax: (248)-524-2700